Socialogy / History I

Slicker

What we are after with the cultural course, is this. This is the course that every man needs to know to be aware, awake human being in the 20th century. That means/every man in Chiago, every man in the United States, every man in the world has this course, he is not finally tooled for action.

This is the dogmatism in this type of model making. Now obviously, then on the other side of that. The time is gone for some one to say, tisk, tish, it out to be something else. If this isn't it. let them make their models. Then there is a possiblity of wrestling back and forth. So here, precisely is the area which every man needs to know. To be tooled to do his task in the midst of history. If it is not this, then you make your own.

Now we will in our time together be alternating between the theoretical and the practical side, or the wisdom and the structure. For example, this week we will embark on Sociology andHistory. We will spend 4 days on that. Then we will pick up the nation and the world. On the practical side and work with that. Then we will take Psy and Art, then Com and Polis, Then at that time we will pick the sciences and philosophy and Ind and fam. So this is the Rthym we will have between the formal and the practical, between the wisdom and the structures as we go through our time together. Now, as all of you know that if I say this is what every man must know to be an educated being, that behind this lies your model and the relationships. We see that ours finally is the task of standing before the Lord of all history. So whatever else, we lives before the utter universality of all things. The futuric bearing in upon us, and the radical demand to be intentional about every dimension of life. And once that decision is made, then we see that we stand over against all of life, and it is here, over against all of life, we must weld out temporal models to be able to grasp that realtionship and toact in the midst of relationships to affirm the totality of reality, or to live before the Lord.

2 Therefore to do this, first of all, is an abstract, or the beginning of working through a model that allows you to finally take in every dimension of life. So here begin at this point, take the one has a reflection pole, and then the practical pole and that mystery, that mystery that we are over against. Here is the dimension that the model begins with

Then at the reflective pole, what we have is the division at this point between the clasical way in which we have seen our models in our university divided between the sciences and the humanities. Here the demand is to live in the midst of the world as it is given, that which allows you to relate to the total dimension of life as it is given, the theology.

here in science is Psychology, Sociology, and Natural Science, here in the Humanities, you take at the this the Arts, History, and Philosophy. Here are the Father Son and Holy Ghost, or to use secular langauge the Upagainstness, the Eventand the decision that relates you to that which is given. In the practical dimension, here is the Individual, the Social and the Church. And later on we will break this dimension down for you. Here in History we have, first of all that which is Unsynonyous with anything that is, - tnen Awe and finally ur image, and again we will have an opportunity to break this down for you - But as you can our main interest is bearing in at this point.

Now, here - the relationship is given - you can see forexample, psychology and the art here, sociology and history her, natural science and philosophy here. In other words, with a model what is demanded first of all is comprehensiveness. Finally, every facet every dimension of life is taken into account, every dimension, every facet of existence is laid out before us and nothing is written left out of the model and, secondly, internal consistency must take place, or rationality must be present in the model and so this is the kind of thing that is set up at the point. Now as you see, we will take a look at the givennes of what goes on. Our relfections on that giveness, or the images that come out of here are the humanities. Now if you will allow you to pick up a particular pole here, I will pick up this Sociological pole, and the pole of history and pull that apart for us.

Here - to pull this one out - we would have the political, and the economic dimension of life, and the cultural and we will take these up in our next three days together.

For example, today we will work with the economic dimension of life. Tomorrow with the political dimension of life, and then the secular dimension and the fourthly the dimension of history. In this as we see, each on e of these particular pole are broken down. For example, if you at this point, take the pole of economics and break it down into the resources. The tools of production and the relations of production. You take the political and break it down into Order, justice and welfare, or well being. The cultural pole, the common sense, common life style, and common symbol.
Therefore in our time togehter we will be spending 3 session on Sociology, the economic, the political and the cultural and one on the whle dimension of history. (You can break this down in the same way, but at this time the main weight will go on the Sociology dimension and then one on the whle dimension of hisotyr and we will work to that on the lat day.

As you know there is no such thing as an economic order, or the economic dimension until the time of the modern world. If you went back to the medieval days where the classical development of the ORDERS came into being,or the sturctures of life, you would find there the STATE AND THE CHURCH. and it was not up until the time of the modern man that you find the ECONOMIC DIMENSION being given to us. But yet the economic base of life is just there, and all of us know that what we bump up against is the struggle that we have just to exist in the midst of history. We find that since the beginning of time, man has had to rustle his life away, so to speak, from nature. He had to pull it out of a of earth, in order for him to be able to make it through the days that had been given him. And then not only was is that because you might say that nature was STINGY. but his resources were scaree and, therefore, we have the rise of the economic dimension of life. And it is just there.

4 For example, here, this kind of thing, the RESOURCES here is Land, technology and capital, on the PRODUCTION here, if you want to say at this oint we have LABOR, INDUSTRY and SYSTEM, as the three parts of this. If you want to take the DISTRIBUTION pole, and say here is SOCIETY, THE INDIVIDUAL AND THEVARIOUS GROUPs. The GOODS, the PROFIT, and the BUDGET.

But I do not want to spent time together in this particular part. Although this is a necessity, and later on we can pushat it. I do want to come back and show how the shift has taken place between theses. But what I am mainly interested in now, is picking up the historical relationships between these various parts of the economic dimension.

For example, if you Communist you can use this. Research, ... If you are a capitalist, use . . . in any body that you have these three poles stand to be dealt with, and the relationship is that area that I want to push at for the remaining time until we come to talk again about the trends in our present time.

To talk about the relatinships of the systems that hold this together, first of all, the difficulties come in many ways between the production and the distribution. If you take, for example, a basic problem of a society is to design those social institutions which mobilize human energy to get the job done. or mobilize it for productive purposes. You know, in our own depression, 1/4 of the whole country was out of work. That is, the working people and these were people that were anxious to have jobs. The factories were empty. People were starving, they had no clothes, they had no means of transportation and yet here was a terrible mystery. Why was this happening? What was taking place? Here you had the resources at hand, and yet something broke down. Here was a terrible mystery in the heart of what was going on. So, the whole job of putting men in the right places to produce that which is properly allocated to the various parts of society, is the whole mechanism that we want to take a look at today. And you can duplicate the kind of crises that taken place.

5 For example, there is one coming up in Britain right now. There is a Seaman strike. There is a different mechanism in operation than there was in !950, although it was the same thing. You recall there, where in !950 in Britain and crisis of not enough men to move in to handle the coal mine. Therefore, a national crisis took place. You could illustrate this at various facets again and again. In the various types of sitaations. ~~But-we~~

But here we are at production. Distribution on the other hand/ you have a situation where people do not receive enough to exist. This is dramatically laid out in the underdeveloped countries. It is also dramatically laid out in the inner city. On the other hand, there are not enough rewards to persuade people that they ought to perform the necessary tasks. Now, if you know the kind of cliches that go on, for example, one man was telling me about watts. He said the people are lazy out there. I said what do you mean. He said, a few miles out of the city the truck farms were begging for hands to take the vegetables in and to bring the fruits in and therefore these people had an opportunity to earn money. They were too lazy. You see, this man did not under stand the economic dimension much less the cultural dimension which we will getø to later on. But here the question of distribution. That people do not receive ~~neough~~/ enough and also øø the proper motivation is not present. Now, to take a look at the way these systems, are related. The first one is that which is very simple. . . Every society operates by this, although as we look in our history we see some that had the main stay of this. For example, here your production problems was very easily solved. You took the job that your poppa had. It was passed on down, the skills were passed on this way. You were born into a trade, and of course, this is dramatically symbolized in the caste system in INDIAN/ Or the Guilds in the Middle ages. But here is the whole question of just the traditional, It was laid out very easily, on Production. And the same, distribution. Tradition laid out how distribution was to take place. If the hunter killed the animal. He got certain best parts of the animal. Poppa of the family, got the next best. Momma got the next best.

6 The children got the entrals and such as this. In other words, everything was laid out and distributed according to tradition. Therefore, you had a peffectly operating economic system in relation to production and distribution in the sense that tradition laid down what should take place. Now,obviously what you have is a static situation. That, economic change is impossible to bring off without blasting reaction in the midst of this situation. Sometimes time this is called the command. sometimes it is called normative hammer the budget system, behind the budget system of course is the authority an norm that is there. This is where authority is imposed upon society. You could trace this back to the Phaorahs of Egypt, to the medieval times,/in both our own western civilization as well as in the Orient, in ancient Rome, and today ~~this problem~~ with communist authority. Of course, in our own society, where this comes about, in dramatic ways, is such things as Marshall Law, such things as rationing. such things as the Draft, as many of you know. The Command situation is just brought into ~~begin~~ being. The authority that Society has just laid down for certain things to take place.

What happens here is the Command, Goals can be chosen by the higher authority, this can be laid down, that can be laid down on behalf of all society, and secondly, the command situation can interfer with the existing order. whereas here with traditions, where you have traditions going down for many years, it would require to change this, here you have dictation of authority the existing order can be flipped over and changed over night. Distribution for a new order or a new for situation, or/new goals can come down from above. All society in some senses operates out of tradition and out of command.

Of course, this has been the primary way that they have operated in the past. but what we come to now is that there is another kind of a market system that has broken into this, and given us a new way of going at things, a new way with modern civilization, not new to you and I here and now in the post modern age. If you want to go back to this, you can look at it starting prior to the !2th century. Here you have great unrest. Here you have the plagues taking place. And as you know there is possibility that the plagues reduced the population to 20%, 80% of the people were wiped out. This is one of the estimates and you can

7 imagine the unrest that was there. Theunsettling of the traditional authority or the way of life. It was- just literally tore the societies apart and the Crusades came out of this, with their conscious and unconscious way of handling the unrest. And in the midst of this they ran into highly developed trade through out the world, and also with it thee accompanying rishes that took place. So what they did, they brought the trade back with them. and now, we have the rise of the Burgers and the beginning of Trade in western civilization, and the great middle ages, drove a wedge between the princes and the serfs. This middle ages this way overcame the kind of dichotomy that was there. Now we had a whole rise in the embryonic form still of a money economy. Borrowing money came into a new way. Money began to flow, Money began to take away- appeal in a brand new way. Wealth prior to this time followed political power. If you were a King you were wealthy, if you were a statesman you were wealthy, wealth always follwed political power. Now POWER began to follow WEALTH. Now this was a radical upheaval and overturning. In other words, a brand new structure came into being. And it is hard for us to imagine the kind of excitement that was taking place. The kind of expansion into new worlds. Our dean friend Columbus made this kind of statement. He said "GOLD is a wonderful thing. Whoever posseses it is master of everything he desires. With ~~gold~~ Gold one can even get into heaven." He was a child of his time, he was expressing the sentiment of his age.

And here, Companies would burst into being. Can you imagine the Hudson Bay Company for example, had an area as large as Britain, Germany and France put together. and brought back wealth that was estimated as more than those three nations put together. This was the kind of excitement that you have. And you had the rushing and movement out throughout the world.

Now, out of this the MARKET ECONOMY came into being. Mind you, you and I on the other side of this take it for granted. But I would like to read to you from one of our contemporary friends in which he poses the kind of question that would come out of someone that had not been ~~born~~ born into the MARKET SYSTEM. "Suppose, for instance, that we were called on to act as Consultants to one of the new nations emerging in Africa. We could imagine the leaders of such a nation

8 saying. 'We have always experienced a highly tradition bound society and way of life. OUr men hunt. They cultivate the fields as and they perform their tasks as they are brought up. Now we are prepared if necessary to sign an edict making it compulsory for every man to work in our comunity and to organize our society

Now, we have come to you to see if there is another way by which we can organize our society.' And so we say "Yes, there is another way. In a market economy, though, no body is assigned to a task. The very idea of a market society is that each person is allowed to decide for himself." Well, there is much consternation among the leaders. 'You mean there is no assignment of some men to mining and others to cattle raising. No matter of selecting some for transportation andothers for cloth weaving. You mean that the people decide for themselves? What happens if they don't decide directly. What happens if no one volunteers to go to production in the mine, or be a rail road engineer?' And so we replied to him, ' You can rest assured, we say to him, that none of that will happen, for in a market society, all the jobs will be filled because it will be to the people's advantage to act that way.' But one of them expresses a little bit of difficulty here. 'But us, he says,'let us suppose that we take your advice and let our people do as they please. Let us talk about something important like cloth production. Just how do we fix the right level of cloth output in a market society?' they asked. 'You know,' we reply, 'We don't? Then how do we know there is going to be enough cloth produced?' ' There will be', we tell him. 'The market will see to it'. 'Well how do we know there won't be too much cloth?' he asked triumphantly. 'Ah, but the market will see to that we say?' 'But what is this market that will do all these wonderful things?? Who runs it?' ' Oh, nobody runs the market we answered. It runs itself. In fact, there really isn't any such things as the market. It is just a word that we use to describe the way the people behave.' 'But I thought people behaved the way they wanted to', the man replied. 'And so they do', we replied, ' but never fear they will want to behave the way that you will want them to behave.'
'Well, I'm afraid'says the chief of the delegation, 'we are wasting out time. We though that you had in time a serious proposal. But what you suggest is madness It is inconceivable. Good day sir.' And with great dignity the delegation takes off."

Well, this is the kind of thing that you and I have inherited. Everyman we could say is extremely selfish and the way this manifests itself is in each person searching out a meaning. Therefore, each person does what is best for his own monetary advantage. And in doing what is best for his own advantage he finally serves the good society and so all the interplay of each man against each other, each picking his own game, lurching out this way and that, is finally going to get the job done that society wants to get done. Now, you can see here that even when the great myth of all that has come out of the middle ages has been destoryed, or all classically expressed in such ways as Providence and other things, finally the Myth here, of the hidden hand comes back in. And you can see this operating Laisse Faire Economics. The myth of the Hidden hand is just there. and it takes place, so that finally society does what you and I would want it to do. In other words, everyone is allowed maximum freedom to do what they want. there is no Tradition necessarily, there is no Command necessarily,

9 Everyone decides on his own and out of his own interests what he needs to do for his own monetary advantage and in doing so society willbe served.

Obviously today this has several different forms in society, the distinction between the market and the command situation. And this third would be the market. If you were looking at history in our time, you would say that on the one hand, the great under developed nations today would be in difficulty if they tried the Market situation. Becuase the command or the authoritarian way is much more functional. It gives them a functional choice to go this way instead of that way. And so, in the inception, or in the beginning, a new nation who finds the command situation probably carries out a much better alternative to getting something done. And you talk to some of the people in the underdeveloped nations. They hate the market system. And we will come back to see why they hate it.

But the main reason they hate is that it does not give them the possibility to do what is necessary to be done.at this moment, that is, to week out this particular goal and do this particular task. Now, the advantage of the command situation is, when this country knows where it wants to go then it can bring into being that which is necessary to do that which it wants to do and if you have any question about this all you have to do is to look to the Saviet Union.

Although in some ways you could call the Soveit Union an industrial nation in 1917, it is utterly impossible to say that in relation to United states and Germany, etc. But is less than 30 years it became the second great power in the world, and that is a sign to every underdeveloped nation throughout the world, that the command or the authoritarian system is an open alternative here for this to happen to them.. Then if you have economics here, you might say, now where it is the command or the authoritian here, the market system seems to come in this point. And it outperforms maybe the command system. And you find especially, the tish-tish= side here. You han

10 se e what they are doing. They are saying - Look at Russia now, they are assigning production quotas to this plants. They are finding here there must be wage differentials to, in order to get tasks done. Decentralization must take place. Mind you, they are still now moving into proviate ownership or capital at all. What they are doing is saying that the market function does have a plac e and you can see this change taking place in the Eastern countries.

Now, you move to the other wide of this, it is more difficult . . . then what in the world is thre for us to take a look at. My lord, at this poin the market system becomes extremely inefficient. For example, at this point . . . the natural profit motive in relationship to public service, in relationship to education, etc. In other words, the market system is inefficient in the sense that people are not seeking these kinds of goals. Only on the other side and therefore, to say that is to move back into some sort of authoritarian way of handlir these kinds of things. Then, not only, in that, but the market system in this kind of economy is always tied to the ~~welfar~~ wealthy. It is a friend of the wealthy and you might say, it is not an enemy, it just simply excludes the poor, You know the War on Poverty we are wages, we are the most affluent nation in the world but the pockets of ~~pov~~ poverty are just, literally, cut off in the market system. Thatis, there is almost no way to proceed from the pockets of poverty to the sphere of affluence in the market system, without bringing in the authoritarian through the war on poverty, etc. So here you can see what is taking place.

Now, therefore planning arises in the midst of an advanced market system, in order to handle such things as the gold-wheat credit. You see that those things have the be done, the market system is not doing it. therefore we bring in the authority or the command in order to get the job done. And this is the direction in which our society is going. And if you don't believe it just ask any John Bircher and he will tell you. It is just there.

So you can see the reason for this is ~~th~~ again pulled back to apparent motivational weaknesses here, does not carry out at this particular point. In other words, the plugged is pulled. So this does not mean now that you

11 are going to have a complete relationship to the authoritanian and market systems something like that. Ghix cixgin gion ix not blurred This distinction is now going to be words, but IDEOLOGIES a brand new understanding as to be worked out. In other words, ideologies have to come into being in order thehandle the economic situation. And I want to say A LITTLE bit more about that. But before I do, I want to come back to this point. We The affluent society under cuts the very principle that produces the affluent society. For example, whereever every chicken gets to be in every pot, who want to out and feed the second chicken. In other words, once you have got that which necessarily allows you to reach the first level of the comfort that you have sought out, so to speak, barriet, then, weh-- the motive that I have to go out to the second level, seem so t motivational seekness in an affluent society. The modifications basis is face

then the motive to go out to the second level, according to this principle seems to be less. Therefore this is the weekness in an affluent society. The motivational basis is scratched, or the plug is pulled on that. Then leisure also calls this into question, and leisure, as you know today, is just radically changing the whole relatinnship of these systems.

The market systems was just always taken for granted as just self-evident Because all of society was thought to have to enter into it. This was mass participation for the market system to take place. Now, it no longer is there going to be mass participation. Not only do you have a motivational weakness but you do not have mass participation. Because in the future, where will it be 20 years, 30 years, there will only be a few of us sent out to work on behalf of the rest of us. Therefore all of us, will not work, or there will not be mass be participation in the things that is taking place. So this undercuts again the basis that the market system has been on. Now. Let's go back and take a look at what in the world it would mean to be in the kind of a situation.

If you want to take Adam Smith and the way that the classical tradition would look at its economic distribution and production if your is not the way you want it, what would you do? Your Laissez faire people would tish tish the doogooders They would tisk tisk doing something to society. They would say welfare is achieved as a by-product of economic action, of every man seeking his own

 end and his own particular status. This is a by product. On the other hand we see this called into question by the Utopian at the end of the !9th century. Or even before that by John Stewart Mills. They were saying here, economics is not the only solution, but society does with the fruits of its production what it chooses to do, with its production and it is not a mechanisal understanding but in their terms there needs to be a moral understanding of what is the done with the fruits of their production. Therefore, they would assert a conscious decision has to be made toward the end of economic planning. And here yo-u can see the borning of the whole way in which the twentieth century task is being taken up. Now. Society ~~betrays~~ displays economic trends. Thre is no question about that, but it does not say that the economic impulse in there alone. In other words, once and for all economic determinism has been pulled in our time. Both the Marxists on the left and the Birchers/(laissez Faire) on the right. Neither one of these can live in the 20th century. Period. You now see that you enter into finally deciding what the economic goals and ends will be. And there economic faith is not the faith is not the ~~fautg-iyt-if-wgueg-~~ faith out of which our society lives.

Capitalism, in the form in which we have seen it has made such change beginning in the !9th cetury, with a classical Union movement.

To /spend/ speak of the future of capitalism, How are we going to do that today? We tied capitalism with the free world. What kind of a tie is this. On the one hand you look, we produce 1/2 of the world's goods. We produce 1/2 of the world's goods, we are 6% of the population, and if we falter in this great race, and by great I mean striving. If we falter, no one will be standing there to pick us up. One They will all be waiting there to see us falter. Because we live in a poverty stricken, restive, antagonistic world. and just here is the kind of place that we are. Therefore,

13. you and I face an overwhelming problem, living in the midst of the greatest capitalism nation in the world, and here are the greatest and most affluent society, and I would submit that first of all it comes through as a political problem, an problem, a social problem, that speaks back that demands a new relationship at this point, Utter clarity that the mechanism is there. Even Galbraith was shouting there in 52 when he wrote his book, that there must an economic ideology

Therefore, this is the kind of inescapable responsibility laid us in our time by virtue of the place that we live.

If you want to take the kind of situation that we are in, if you wanto to choose on the extreme left of our society. The Marxist here has said that this is just the direction that history is going And the only thing that you can do is just the design the way of this thrust in the midst of history. This is just the way things are: I don't know if you if you talk about socialistm, if you talk about a ... new left, you can talk about a nationalist block of underdevelpped countries. But these see that there is not such thing as a deterministic inevitability of history. What you do is that you enter in to shape tomorrow and that you are utterly responsible for taking that upon yourself and here it is that you grab hold.

Now, these people here are again going to use the Command situation. And some of our economists call this, they say ~~Some of our economists say~~ this is the highest form over against what you and I would call the low form. Why have all the bloody revolutions. Why did we not work it out peacefully over a period of time. Just think how many people are killed, how many people are hurt, why not let it work itself out over the years, with peaceful methods and ~~pattern.~~ And here romantic capitalism is dieing, or you want to put over here, completely gone now is laissez faire capitalism. which is just a as deterministic as this. You move into some place, and you make this decision. 6 million people died in the early 30s in order for Russia to exercise a command situation, to move from an underdeveloped country to a developed country. To move from a backward country into a country people are affluent. And I don't mean affluent like us,

14 I mean where they can eat and have houses, or where they can educate their people. 6,million people were plowed under in the early thirties. That is what I mean by the high cost of the command or the authorizan situation. But on the other hand, as some Asian economist put it. What you have here for example, in Asia today. 100 asians being born to 100 American children. At the age of 65, there will be more alive in America than there will be alive at 5 in Asia. Now you want to talk about the high cost. Which is the high cost. that is the question? Which is the high cost?

To move over just to say a few quick things about where we are. We are in a post-modern, post-capitalistic world. And the way for the future is a planned economy. Here for example, you take the Kansiam, they say you decide what the goals are and we will bring them off. We will bringhtem about. And then all of your know in time magazine a few ~~years ago~~ motngs months ago, there came out of our own top eschalon, is, we are all Kanisiam now. We are all Kansian now.

I was pushed hard by a young Comminist when I said Communism is dead. That is, classical orthodox marxism. He pushed back, what do you think it is going to be a coallition of capitalism and communism. You could see where he had his knives out. And you could come back at him say the dialectic is going to be

A whole new model is coming into being.
And that model is coming into being through the trend in the Un.S. If you want to call it planned capitalism. or motivated budget mechanism, or motivated command mechanism. Either way you go you have hold both of the calssical dimension of this system into being. They are here in history and they must be dealt with. The facts of our trends of life are just going in that direction. Now, to do this means that we have go to see where the trends are going in our day in order to be able to weld this out. Now let me go back to our . . .

15. You take for example the resources that are here and then the tools and then the distribution or the relation and the resources for example, back in the tribal days, or the ancient days, you had common property. owned by the family, owned by the tribe and then you moved from common property into individual property and here again you have (if you move into a command society) you have state owned property for your resources. If you want to come back and pick up the land, the technology and the capital that is find, but where the shift is moving to day in the sense of resources is to technological knowhow. My lord, you see underdeveloped countries. where someone says what is the problem in underdeveloped countries, they do not have the technological knowhow, they do not have the technological knowhow. And every person that you can ask that question to you can almost be usre that the first thing that he says is this, the technological knowhow. And you know how we use this as a weapon against certain people that want the command situation in underdeveloped countries. We say, ah, but if we withdraw they will not have technological knowhow.

Just look at this, if you know how to operate a computer today you are in, aren't you. If you don't you are out. That is just the way it is.

What is that going to mean 30 years from now. 10 years from now we are going to be carrying them around like transitor radios, everyone can operate them. 10 years from now everyone will look like he has got a PHD and we are in the first grade at this point. That as far as this kind of relationship to technological knowhow. The man that has this has the resources. When you look at the underdeveloped countries, we do not first of all say, well now Chili has this, or Brazil has that, we say of them they do not have technological knowhow..

First of all, you had just a hoe, then you moved into large industry, then we find today the industrial revolution = and now the tool here is technology. those of you that are phi beta kappas

16. And that is what we know to know, to know what is taking place. The electronic revolution. Here is where the tools of production are taking place, where production comes about. The /¢¢1/ electronics revolutinn is just here. You know all the forms and names by which this goes.

Then over here we started out with common ownership, and then individual ownership, w e came out with dividends and wages ,et c. Now we have moved back to a world wide ownership. You see finally, you can not talk about distribution today, unless you talk about worldwide ownership of the product/ø/ s or the distrubution of products to the people's needs. You and I have already waid that in the United Staes. For example, the war on poverty, is already spending more money than is necessary to guarantee everyone of you and me a substantial annual wage. Already the war and poverty ~~is-on~~ ¢ has moved beyond the level of where by you and I could recieve monetary benefits that ~~owul-~~ would feed us and cloth us. We have already moved that far in the United Sates. And the reason we have not moved in any further

You know that we cannot continue to live in the world like this, when the rest of the world is starving to death. Here is where /j¢/ the pole of the economic revolution is putting the strape upon us to reaise the question of the ideological or the political and cultural question, precisely at this point. Then, if you want to put it ~~metaphorically~~ this way, here is where the question is rasied. Any fool can develop an antomic bomb today, any fool can develop a computer today, no longer is this a barrier. Therefore you ~~are-¢¢-K-~~ and I know that the trend of tomorrow moves to that where everyone is going to guaranteed rights to health, rithts to education, rights to civil participation and youand I know that whatever kind of economic relationships or systems or models are moved out, they just automoatically have to meet this kind of situation, or else there will be no tomorrow but chaos.

17. One thing about the people that are awake or aware today. It is just as plain to them as if it were written across their chests. This is the kind of world that we live in. and therefore the economic system has to finally take these things into account.

Now as important as the economic base is, you and I can see that Kanian economics or however you want to you it, that If I know the ~~goald,~~ goal has been set out the economics can be brought about. The question is, who is going to set the goals. Are the goals going to take into account the whole world. Are the goals going to take into account the relationships of all mankind. And it is here ~~it~~ then that the question of economics is raised. And once you move into that you are moving into the political and you move into the cultural. Or what kinds of goals are necessary. And this is where we will be moving next week into the political and the next session in to the cultural.